



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the gradual evolution of groups held together by their views of war policy. Mr. Brummer is distinctly a "Unionist", and he does not seem quite fair to the greatest figure with whom he has to deal, Horatio Seymour. He brings out more clearly than ever before the reasons for Seymour's failure to grasp the helm of the Democratic party, and, by inference, the loss that party sustained in Douglas; but he fails to appreciate, at least sympathetically, Seymour's point of view. Thurlow Weed has never been better revealed, and the portrait gains by being sympathetic. Weed's subtle virtues, unlike Seymour's, evaporate under too severe criticism. The number of interesting men concerned with the politics of a single state is remarkable, and in general the descriptions of them are lively, and the estimates of their character, sound.

Mr. Porter is somewhat more judiciously minded than Mr. Brummer, or at least does not express his own opinions so freely. His statement at the beginning of his discussion of the Peace Democracy, that its leaders "continued to use argument when emotion was dominant" (p. 128), is not borne out by his subsequent account of their policies (pp. 189, 191, 225, etc.), and the quotations from their turgid speeches (pp. 157, 178). Yet his account of that movement as a whole is colorless in the better sense. In citing acts of Congress he should have referred to the *Statutes*, rather than to McPherson's *History of the Rebellion* (p. 105). William Allen should not be referred to as *Governor* in the Bibliographical Note (p. 255), and as *Senator* elsewhere (pp. 133, 229, etc.). A commendable feature, not found in Mr. Brummer's work, is the mapping of significant votes. In this way Mr. Porter has made plain the remarkable persistence of Ohio's political geography. Still scarcely enough is made of geography, and particularly of Ohio's contact with the slave-holding states. The Border-State convention is not mentioned. Of course, the chief personal interest centres in the career of Vandaligham, and the portion of the book dealing with him is undoubtedly the best. The account of Vandaligham, however, like that of all other leaders, is so purely objective that no concept of his character is given. It may be that the historian should present historic figures solely through their acts, but politics alone do not give a wide enough basis of fact to afford grounds for a just estimate. The discussion of negro suffrage with which the book closes is well done, and contains some new material.

CARL RUSSELL FISH.

Robert E. Lee: Man and Soldier. By THOMAS NELSON PAGE.
(New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1911. Pp. xviii, 734.)

MR. PAGE wrote this life "in obedience to a feeling that as the son of a Confederate soldier, as a Southerner, as an American, he, as a writer, owes something . . . which he should endeavor to pay" (p. xv). He believes that: "The reputation of the South has suffered because we have allowed rhetoric to usurp the place of history" (xviii). His thesis is that Lee belongs to the first rank of captains though whether

one of six or one of fourteen, is not clear (p. 68). He wishes, therefore, to be judged from the historical and literary points of view, and as to his success in maintaining his thesis.

Mr. Page's reputation makes it unnecessary to say that there is good writing. It soon becomes obvious, however, that he is not at home in handling documents. Particularly, the repetition of phrases and facts becomes wearisome, and the total literary effect of the book is heavy.

Historically, Mr. Page has made use of the best authorities, but there are many minor errors. The Whisky Rebellion occurred before Washington's death (p. 9). Historians will agree that the states "at last" bore the expense of their cadets at West Point; but the statement: "There being at that time no high tariff and no internal revenue taxation to maintain the National Government, [they] made a yet more direct contribution than since the war" (p. 42), is mysterious. More important is the fact that he has not been able to escape his prejudices, though in many cases he has made an heroic attempt to do so: a struggle which often gives an appearance of inconsistency. On page 68 he praises Grant highly, but in the discussion of Grant's campaigns he does not give him sufficient ability to put Lee into proper relief. It certainly was not "novel to question" the "right" of secession in 1861 (p. 45). His discussion of the "resources" of the sections (pp. 67-79) is valueless. He shares John Randolph's prejudice in favor of the "good old thirteen states" (pp. 78 ff.).

As a study of Lee, the book, in spite of an effort to avoid it (p. xv), resembles too much the early lives of Washington. Lee is so well rounded, so self-contained, that it is difficult to bring him before a subsequent generation. This book does comparatively little to accomplish it; it is almost totally lacking in the keen analysis that marks Gamaliel Bradford's recent articles in the *Atlantic*. The main emphasis is on Lee's military genius, and here Mr. Page falls into an error which Lee himself always avoided—that of blaming subordinates, or the government, or chance, for Lee's failures, except those due to lack of resources. It never seems to occur to Southern writers that the Northern army had anything to do with the result at Gettysburg. Mr. Page can hardly bring himself to criticize the Virginian Stuart, and so puts the blame on Longstreet who is a general scapegoat. The failure to crush McClellan was due to Jackson. The battle of Malvern Hill was practically a Confederate success. Lee's first invasion of Maryland and his failure to crush Hooker at Chancellorsville and Grant in the Wilderness, were due to strange mishaps. That the commander was in any way responsible for his subordinates, is mentioned only once (p. 617), that military operations are generally liable to strange mishaps is never mentioned. It can hardly be expected that this book will be of any weight in establishing Lee's position as a general; its study of his character is not a contribution to the literature on the subject, but may enlighten many who have not read Mr. Bradford's articles or Lee's own letters.